

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicants' remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Amendment to the Specification

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment to the specification does not contain new matter. The original specification uses the term "information" to mean information that enables the firmware to access the contents of a computer media. Pg 7, lines 3-5. File system drivers and the location of such drivers are embodiments of such information. Pg 2, lines 3-9; pg 6, lines 8-12. Despite the consistent use in the original specification and claims of the term "information" in this narrower sense, a reader may wrongly assume that the data contents of the computer media are also "information." Replacing the term "information" where appropriate in the specification and claims with "media data access information" will aid a reader in understanding this distinction.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Applicants note at the outset that a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *DeRosa, Jr. et al.* (US 5,822,565).

As amended, claim 1 recites a method which reads, extracts or accesses content from a "self-describing media." In contrast, there is no self-describing media disclosed in *DeRosa*. As disclosed in the Application's specification, a "self-describing media" is a media, such as a magnetic tape or disk, from which all the necessary *media data access information* can be read or extracted from that media itself. *Media data access information* is information, not part of the computer system's firmware, which the firmware uses to access the data contents of that media. *Media data access information* includes file system drivers and the locations of such drivers.

DeRosa does not disclose "self-describing media." While *DeRosa* discloses that information may be read, accessed or extracted by the firmware from a media (disk drive 12, col. 4, line 33-38), *DeRosa* does not disclose that this information is the *media access information* for

the media the firmware is trying to access. In fact, *DeRosa* does not even disclose information that is *media access information*. *DeRosa* discloses portions of content that may be read, extracted or accessed from a media, such as “configuration files” and a “configuration utility,” but these portions of content are described as functioning to allocate computer system resources, not providing *media access information*. Specifically, these portions of content disclosed in *DeRosa* do not, as claim 1 recites, extract “a second portion of the content...using the description of the content in the first portion of the content.” Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that *DeRosa* does not anticipate claim 1 as amended and that the claim is allowable.

Claims 2-12 are dependent on claim 1 and thus are not anticipated by *DeRosa* for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2-12 are allowable.

Claim 13, as amended, is a claim for a device that performs a method similar to the method claimed in claim 1. Thus, for reasons similar to those given for claim 1, the Applicants respectfully assert that *DeRosa* does not anticipate claim 13 as amended and that the claim is allowable.

Claims 14-20 are dependent on claim 13 and thus are not anticipated by *DeRosa* because claim 13 is not. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 14-20 are allowable.

Claim 21, as amended, is a claim for a computer system that performs a method similar to the method claimed in claim 1. Thus, for reasons similar to those given for claim 1, the Applicants respectfully assert that *DeRosa* does not anticipate claim 21 as amended and that the claim is allowable.

Claims 22 and 24-27 are dependent on claim 21 and thus are not anticipated by *DeRosa* for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 21. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 22 and 24-27 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-22 and 24-27 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: _____

4/4/2006

Philip Hunt
Reg. No. 58,044

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778